



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,273	12/22/2000	Larry G. Fischer	100.047US04	3196
34206	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
FOGG AND ASSOCIATES, LLC			CORSARO, NICK	
P.O. BOX 581339			ART UNIT	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1339			PAPER NUMBER	
			2680	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/747,273	Applicant(s) FISCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Nick Corsaro	Art Unit 2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 59-105 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-23 and 59-105 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 08/27/2001 and 10/04/2004 proposes amendments to the reissue application that do not comply with 37 CFR 1.173(b), which sets forth the manner of making amendments in reissue applications. A supplemental paper correctly amending the reissue application is required.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this letter is set to expire ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this letter.

Note: Each time an applicant submits an amendment the amendment is being made with respect to the issued patent. Therefore, each time a new claim to the original patent is presented the new claim must be underlined and when those claims are amended in further amendments the entire claims should be underlined. See, 37 CFR 1.173(b).

### ***Reissue Application Supplemental Declaration***

2. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

Claims 10-23 and 59-105 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. See 37 CFR 1.175. The nature of the defect is set forth above.

Receipt of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) will overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251. An example of acceptable language to be used in the supplemental oath/declaration is as follows:

“Every error in the patent which was corrected in the present reissue application, and is not covered by a prior oath/declaration submitted in this application, arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant.”

Note: Every time there is a departure from the original patent, this departure is an error.

As a result, a supplemental declaration is required to cover all errors not covered by the prior declaration. See 37 CFR 1.175.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 10, 14, 18, 19, 20, and 23, are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,879. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the identified claim of the patent comprises the subject matter, contained in claims of the application, however the claims of the patent contains additional subject matter omitted in the claims of the application. Nevertheless, omission of an element and its function in combination is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963). Therefore, the claims of the application are obvious over the claims of the patent. See the subject matter correspondence table below.

Art Unit: 2684

5. Claims 59-105 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,879. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the identified claim of the patent comprises the subject matter, contained in claims of the application, however the claims of the patent contains additional subject matter omitted in the claims of the application. Nevertheless, omission of an element and its function in combination is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same functions as before. In re KARLSON (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963). Therefore, the claims of the application are obvious over the claims of the patent. See the subject matter correspondence table below.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claim 1-9, are allowed.

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nick Corsaro whose telephone number is 571-272-7876. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A Maung can be reached on **571-272-7882**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Nick Corsaro

**NICK CORSARO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Primary Examiner  
(703) 306-5616